



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/078,713

02/19/2002

Yoshiyuki Namizuka

RCOH-1045

5363

21302 7590 10/22/2008

KNOBLE, YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY

EIGHT PENN CENTER

SUITE 1350, 1628 JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD

PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

ROSARIO, DENNIS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Amendment

1. The after final amendment was received on 10/7/08. Claims 1-5,7-10,12,13,15,15,18,19,21-24,26,27,29-37,39,40 and 42-47 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/7/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant disagrees with the examiner's interpretation of the claimed processing mode. The examiner's interpretation of the claimed processing mode is understood to mean that the processing mode is inputted but not clear by who or what inputs the processing mode. Even the inputting of the user input value can be input by anything. The adjectives of the claimed "user input value" appear to explain who or what is inputting the user input value, but the user input value still can be inputted by anything or anybody since the claim does not clearly state who or what is inputting the user input value. The examiner suggests "inputting a user input value as done by a user including inputting a processing mode as done by a user" such a statement clearly identifies who is inputting the user input value and the processing mode.

Applicants state that neither of them ($K=0$ or $K=\text{non-zero}$) suggests a set of predetermined correction coefficients. The examiner respectfully disagrees since $K=0$ in fig. 3:80 and $K=\text{non-zero}$ in fig. 3:81 when considered as a whole are coefficients that are predetermined relative to the switch in fig. 3:79 that selects among the two coefficients of $K=0$ and $K=\text{non-zero}$.

Applicants state that the examiner did not respond to applicants arguments regarding Goto of May, 8, 2008. The examiner notes that applicants arguments are directed to unclaimed matter: "user input of a processing mode." Thus, the examiner has addressed applicant's arguments of May, 8, 08 regarding Goto.

3. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., " 'processing mode' that is inputted by the user" and "'processing mode' to be inputted in the 'user input value'" on page 8 and "user input of 'a processing mode'" on page 9 and "threshold values are automatically generated based upon the input image" on page 9 and "threshold values are automatically generated based upon the input image without manually inputted data by the user through human intervention" and "user input of 'a processing mode'" on page 11) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

/Dennis Rosario/

Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Matthew C Bella/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624